DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 689 HE 002 089

TITLE	Discrimination against Women at the University of Pittsburgh.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa.
PUB DATE	Nov 70
NOTE	71p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel, College Students, *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), *Employment Patterns, Faculty, *Females, *Higher Education, Salaries, Social Discrimination, *Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

This report documents the activities of the University Committee for Women's Rights (UCWR) at Pittsburgh University over a 1-year period. The chapters cover UCWR's negotiations with the University, summarize the data compiled, and present proposals for improving the condition of women. Data on faculty include: men and women faculty in 8 selected departments by rank, new faculty appointments for 14 schools by rank, participation rates in the standing committees of the University Senate for 2 years, and the percentage of the different faculty positions held by women. Other chapters include an introduction to UCWR, UCWR attempts to review salaries, discrimination against women students, UCWR's interaction with the administration, women in staff positions, UCWR's efforts in relation to the law, and a summary of the obstacles UCWR met in pursuing its goals. (AF)

ED049689

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

A Report Compiled by

The University Committee for Women's Rights

November, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002089

numbered 2 pages (13)

CONTENTS

1. Intorduction to the UCWR 1

2. Salary Discrimination: Request for Data 4

3. Women Students 6

4. Women Faculty 14

5. The Administration 27

6. The Staff 32

7. Discrimination and the Law 36

8. Conclusion 39

9. Appendices 43

A. Freedom of Information at State Universities.

B. Letter of 2 June 1970 from Gilbert T. Venable, Executive Director, ACLU Pittsburgh, to W. H. Rae, Chairman, University of Pittsburgh, Board of Trustees.

C. Request for Data

1. Chancellor's memo 22 January 1970

2. Letter of 16 February 1970 from Dr. Ina Braden to Chancellor Posvar

3. Letter of 20 February 1970 from Dr. Ina Braden to Mr. Montgomery

4. Letter of 20 February 1970 from Dr. Ina Braden to Chancellor Posvar

5. Mr. Montgomery's memo 26 February 1970

6. Mr. Montgomery's memo 2 March 1970

D. Letter of 18 May 1969 from Dorin Schumacker to R. H. McCoy, Director of Graduate Programs, University of Pittsburgh.

E. Statement of Catherine Edner-Sypher.

F. Chancellor's memo 29 May 1970: Educational and Career Opportunities for Women.

G. Complaint under Executive Orders 11246 and 11375

1. Letter of 26 March 1970 from Dr. Ina Braden to George P. Schultz, Secretary of Labor

2. Letter of 15 April 1970 from John L. Wilks, Director, OFCC, Department of Labor, to Dr. Ina Braden

3. Letter of 13 May 1970 from Rose E. Brock, contract Compliance Specialist, HEW, to Dr. Ina Braden

Tables

1. Data on Selected Departments

2. New Faculty Appointments, 1969

3. Standing Committees of the University Senate, 1969-70, 1970-71

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE UCWR

The University Committee for Women's Rights (UCWR) was formed in the fall of 1969 to organize feminists at the University of Pittsburgh and coordinate their activities.

> The purpose of the University Committee for Women's Rights is to foster the welfare of women associated with the University of Pittsburgh by promoting the improvement of general employment practices and by promoting change in all University practices which work to the economic, social, or psychological deteriment of women. This committee will work both within the University itself and in association with community groups which have similar work.

We hope that this report, which attempts to chronicle the activities of the UCWR during its first year of existence, will display to the University community, and other interested parties, the magnitude of the problem we face. It will show (1) that discrimination against women <u>does</u> exist at the University and is in fact built into the system, and (2) that the attempts of the UCWR to change the system by negotiating through the appropriate channels led only to frustration and ultimate appeal to external enforcement agencies.

The early activities of the UCWR were restricted to interviews with individuals who had grievanies against the University, and inquiries as to the ratio of men to women in various University schools and departments. These activities elicited courtesy and cooperation from the administration. But as the committee proceeded, and discovered that only a full-scale statistical survey of employment practices would reveal the Universities institutionalized discrimination, the attitude of the administration stiffened. Its refusal to take any appropriate action on our grievancies or to provide us with the necessary personnel information illustrates the classic bureacratic response: don't take action - set up an investigation instead. It took almost a year for us to persuade the University to make

even the gesture of setting up the Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities.

The following chapters document our negotiations with the University and summarize the data we were able to compile. We have also in the course of the year made many proposals for improving the condition of women. Many of these would be expensive to the University:

Up-grade secretarial salaries

Provide an adequate day-care center

Establish a School for Interdisciplinary Feminist Studies

Pay women faculty the salaries their qualifications entitle them to

Grant women students financial aid equal to men's

But there are also many steps the University could take immediately without cost:

Make public the salaries of all University employees

Allow Planned Parenthood to establish a center on campus

Encourage the University Press to publish work by women

End the channeling of women by Personnel into exclusively clerical positions

Revise the job-classification system

List <u>all</u> job openings with Personnel

Black-list recruiters whose firms follow discriminatory employment practices

End the requirement that women have higher qualifications than men for admission and promotion

Apply for foundation or federal funds to support inter-disciplinary research on feminism.

As we see it, the University has, over the past year, displayed an exemplary ability to stall, issue high-sounding policy statements which signify nothing, and cloud the true issues with changes that we do not represent the women of the University. It is true that not every female University employee has joined UCWR. Does that mean we should cease

demanding women's legal rights? The University seems unaware of the fact that it is flouting the law in continuing to discriminate against women. This is the ultimate basis on which we rest: that state and federal laws prohibit sex discrimination. We are determined that the University of Pittsburgh shall obey the law.

2. SALARY DISCRIMINATION: REQUEST FOR DATA

One point of attack of the UCWR was salary discrimination. Although you can begin to get a good idea of the vast amount of salary discrimination in the University by talking to the first five women you meet in the halls, it is necessary to come up with hard facts to convince those people with vested interests in the system that their large salaries are the result of others' loss. One method to tie together separate instances of salary discrimination is by a statistical analysis of a large number of apparently unrelated cases. Using statistical techniques, it is possible to see to what extent different aspects of an individual, such as sex, color, age, and education, are related to earnings. Analyses of this type isolate patterns of discrimination, and invalidate the argument that "although Mrs. X does draw a very small salary, women as a whole are not discriminated against here," which is a favorite ploy of many employers.

For this reason, UCWR decided it was necessary to get data about the salaries of as many university employees as possible to prove the extent and magnitude of discrimination due to sex. We hoped that this would be easy, because Pitt, as a state related institution, is obligated to supply taxpayers with information about the institutions which they finance. (See Appendix A.) Moreover, statistical information of this type has been admitted by the courts as evidence of discrimination. (See Appendix B.)

In the early stages of this campaign, the University seemed willing to cooperate. At a meeting on 14 January 1970 Chancellor Posvar agreed to allow UCWR access to information to study discrimination, and in a subsequent memo be specified that the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Finance would obtain the relevant data. Our efforts during the rest of January and early February to actually obtain this data met with a variety of excuses and delays. Finally, due to the protest of a single woman

professor, the administration felt obliged to offer the data in a form which, by concealing the department to which it applied, rendered it useless to the UCWR. (A selection of letters on this issue is contained in Appendix C.)

Thus final refusal prompted UCWR to file a complaint with the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, Pittsburgh. Action taken under this complaint would include the requisitioning of the data we were negotiating for. Our relationship with the University was stripped of empty rhetoric and became cordially hostile.

3. WOMEN STUDENTS

The treatment of women students is perhaps the most critical area of sex discrimination in any university. By assuming the responsibility for educating a new generation of leaders in politics, business, and the community, the University can make significant contributions to cultural change. If the young women are taught a sense of inferiority by their treatment in the universities, the nation as well as the individual suffers from the resulting loss in human resources.

Admissions

In the September 11, 1969 issue of the University Times the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Mr. Kobosky, indicated that male students are admitted to undergraduate school with somewhat lower qualifications than female students: 66 percent of the men but 76 percent of the women ranked in the top 1/5 of their high school class. In the latest 1970 figures supplied by Mr. Kobosky, 2,752 males were admitted as compared to only 2,075 females. Although the figures which would enable us to determine how many qualified women were refused are omitted from the report sent us, it is the view of the UCWR that even if only one qualified woman was denied admission on the basis of sex it would be a serious injustice.

Another way in which discrimination operates is to use as the criterion for admission different qualifications for women than those used for men. Asking women questions about their marital status, age of children, or even about their plans concerning family or reproductive life is unfair since the interviewers' preconceived ideas concerning these matters may influence their judgment about whether the applicant should be accepted.

Medical School. In American Medical Schools there is a well-known "quote system" which restricts the number of women to 7 percent or less. Recent figures from the University of Pittsburgh Medical School are what

you would expect if a quota system were operating: the percentage of women students is now 7 percent. Even worse, the percentage has been decreasing over the last several years with the exception of the 1970-71 class which has a few more women than usual, possibly due to feminist activity. We heard indirectly that one of the members of the admissions board said if he had his way no women would be admitted to medical school. This attitude prevails despite the fact that the lowest score for any woman on an objective criterion for admissions was higher than the median of that for the men. Thus all the women who were admitted were better qualified than 50 percent of the men. In the face of the desperate need for a greater number of physicians and the equally desperate need for physicians with what we have stereotyped as female characteristics such as devotion to and human concern for people, this particular area of discrimination is particularly reprehensible.

School of Education. In the School of Education group interviews were held for those interested in primary education. Many of the women applicants were interviewed by a black and a white man and were questioned on sex relationships, reactions, and attitudes. One young woman was required to go with one of the male interviewers in his car to a school, since he said he did not have time to interview her. When a faculty member from the Greensburg campus telephoned the director of the department about the entire situation, she was treated as an inferior and put down. Eventually the Dean of the School of Education did respond, stating his intention to change the procedures and to accept the women who had been rejected. Since most of the women had made other plans this action came too late. Those who do plan to enter the School of Education are very apprehensive about what sexist treatment they will continue to receive.

Such experiences destroy a woman's self-image and her will to follow a career.

Graduate School of Public Health. A woman who applied to go into Hospital Administration was told by one interviewer she should not go to work but should remain at home with her children. Another told her she could not be a hospital administrator because it was too demanding. Questions were asked about her family life and children, and she was told she could not enter the course since she was immobile, and so could not get a job. Her denial had no effect. A psychologist interviewer stated as she was leaving that since the interview had been so difficult, she probably would go home and collapse. She replied that she must return to work.

Scholarship Aid

We all know that some people still are being denied an education and some are retarded in achieving their educational goals because of lack of financial support. This is especially a problem for women who are presently unable to make the high wages which are available to many men for part-time and summer jobs. The following table compares scholarship aid for men and women:

Scholarships, Office of Student Aid

1969-70	Total Number	Total Aid Awarded	Average Aid Awarded (per student)
Female	2,564	$2,218,803	$865
Male	3,862	$3,368,373	$872

Special Educational Programs

One of the most exciting programs recently developed at Pitt was the Intercultural House. This house provides residence, board, and

scholarships for black and white students in the belief that the experience of living together will promote understanding between the races. However, this experience and these scholarships are restricted to men only. This spring, 1970, a group of young women requested separate but equal facilities but have received nothing.

Another special facility which is open to female as well as male students is the PESO program. This program attempts to find fellowships and scholarships for women and men who wish to be admitted to educational programs beyond the bachelor's degree. Despite the admitted success of the program and despite the fact that this program is crucial to women who have a greater difficulty in receiving all forms of fellowship and scholarship aid, the program has never been fully funded and adequate help in the form of staff personnel to properly serve the students in an expanded program has not been provided.

Fellowships and Assistantships

Because of the age and life stage of graduate students, receipt of financial aid is often a crucial factor in determining whether education can be continued or not. Unfortunately, the awarding of fellowships and assistantships is another area where discrimination operates. In the History Department, for example, the teaching fellowships for 1969-1970 which pay $300 per year more than teaching assistantships are heavily weighted with males (20 men to 3 women) while the lower paying teaching assistantships are distributed to 7 males and 8 females. Incidentally, teaching assistantships require the student to do work not directly related to acquiring a degree whereas fellowships usually do not. When budgets are cut, the first people to be affected are invariably women.

In the same department, before vigorous student dissent occurred to challenge the decision, the problem of a cut back in funds for 1970-1971 was solved by not renewing grants to married women, ignoring the fact that some married women, and especially those who have the expense of child care, may be less capable of maintaining themselves in school than some men. The assumption is repeatedly made by universities that women, and married women in particular, do not need money. But the point in the History Department was that the decision was made on the basis of sex, not on the basis of financial need or other relevant criteria.

The letter in Appendix D illustrates the determination and spirit required of women in order to combat such discrimination.

The UCWR would like to know:

1. How many men as compared to women applied for aid and how did they find out how to apply?
2. Who developed the guidelines by which the recipients were selected? Both men and women?
3. What are the guidelines? What is the sex ratio of the people who decide?
4. What would a projection of the trends reveal? Are things getting better or worse for women?

Advising and Placement

Advising and placement services at Pitt, whether formal or informal, exhibit the dominant male attitudes towards the place of women. UCWR has heard of many instances where women students have been told by their teachers that women do not belong in a particular discipline. One departmental chairman even said that he felt obliged to tell the aspiring students that they would have a hard time combining a family with a career.

"Advice" of this sort, together with the scarcity of women faculty to serve as role models, convinces all too many students that their place is truly in the home.

The more formal role played by the University Placement Services can be crucial to the kind of job the graduate obtains, and to the attitude the graduate holds toward a career. To be treated as inferior at this point may severely limit a person's aspirations and the will to develop potential abilities and interest.

The Placement Service at the University of Pittsburgh is divided into full-time and part-time services and the University's School of Education conducts an Educational Placement Service. The directors of these services as of June, 1970 were all men, white, and apparently over 50. The two major directors recently hired one woman each as assistant staff members. The part-time service has only one staff member, a man.

A member of UCWR who is a Ph.D. candidate at the University, filed an application with both the Educational Placement Office and the Placement Service. When they failed to provide her with any assistance, or even information on available jobs, she filed an informal complaint with the Human Relations Commissions, within the context of the formal complaint filed by UCWR. The compliance officer then set up meetings with the two directors and the complainant.

Both directors stated that they did not discriminate on the basis of sex. The director of the Placement Services, however, said repeatedly that job notices on the official bulletin board stated whether a male or female was required. Both directors stressed that all placement results from the memory of the staff person, nothing is computerized.

They emphasized their personal contacts, both in learning of jobs and in placing persons whom they knew would fit the needs of the person making the request.

Thus there is no systematization of the process of receiving job requests, searching for applicants, or notification of job openings, with the obvious result that personal bias is free to operate.

The present situation obviously leads to severe discrimination against women through the sexist attitudes of the placement staff and the functioning of the services which provides for all placement to take place through the personal responses and acquaintances of the male directors. UCWR knows of no woman who has received positive assistance from the University Placement Services in finding a position suitable to her educational qualifications and her abilities. Private employment agencies do not do better, and so the University-trained woman is left alone to fight employment discrimination.

Conclusions

Despite the fact that our perliminary investigation was seriously hampered by the University's refusal to divulge what is defined as public information, we find strong evidence for discrimination on the basis of sex in admissions and in the areas related to admissions such as scholarship and fellowship assistance and in advising. We haven't even touched on other critical areas of discrimination such as recruiting or, more often for women, lack of recruiting, and discouragement of women students by discriminatory treatment in the classroom. The chances of the tzlented American woman getting the kind of education and employment

opportunities which would allow her to fulfill her potential for being a physician, scientist, academician, dentist or engineer and thus contribute significantly to society are extremely limited and for many individuals are nonexistent. It's just not true that American women choose not to continue their education, rather they are discouraged overtly and covertly by virtually all the practices in our tax-supported institutions.

In case you wonder whether universities could be simply informed that the situation exists and requested to change, let me state that we have tried all the channels including the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, Administrators, and the Faculty Senate. No substantial improvement has occured. We in the University Committee for Women's Rights are absolutely convinced that discrimination against women, which has been called the only form of discrimination which is still socially accepted, is rampant throughout higher education, and strong effective legislation is needed if women are ever to achieve equal educational opportunity.

At the present time no research has been sponsored by the University except that forced on them by enforcement agencies. No school or department has been founded, no faculty hired to work on the problem which is reflected in the discriminatory admissions. In fact they have recently fired a psychologist, a national leader in the area of women's rights, Dr. Jo Ann Gardner, and without strong legislative support other activist faculty will be endangered and still others will be intimidated and unable to fight for equality from within.

Some faculty who would like to convert their present curriculum into one more reflective of the role of women find great difficulty because their own training was so male oriented. Students who wish to do research on topics related to sex discrimination have no opportunity

for adequate supervision and cannot take a degree in the field which affects all of our lives, whether you call it a study of feminism, sexuality, discrimination, sex role training, family living, human development or life styles.

One final note is that the policies and practices of some departments and schools are no doubt even worse than those reported because where the need for secrecy is greatest and where the number of women students are fewest is where we were least able to obtain data. This report has indicated that leadership in the area of eliminating discrimination on the basis of sex has <u>not</u> been forthcoming from the University itself. In the past the law has often led the way to social progress and if progress is to come before frustration produces disenchantment with the law, legislation must be produced which will be just, strong, effective and at this point it also needs to be prompt.

4. WOMEN FACULTY

Despite the long history of women's education in the United States and the existence of women's colleges with high academic standards, the American university is a male-dominated institution. Overall, the percentage of women in professional, administrative, instructional and research positions in institutions of higher education has fallen from 27.6 percent in 1940 to 22.2% in 1963. Lacking precise statistical data on conditions at Pitt, the UCWR has relied on partial information, spot checks, and interviews, all of which lead to the conclusion that the outlook for women faculty is a grim one. All of us know highly qualified women, some of them educated in the best universities in the world or trained by the best scientists who are either unemployed or working at jobs so far beneath their level of competence and so poorly paid that they might as well have remained uneducated. There are many different ways in which departments discriminate against the women who are lucky enough to escape the frequent firing and replacement of women by a less qualified male or by a more docile female. While women are working at the University they are very often given heavier teaching and advising loads. Their morale and motivation is weakened by constant "put downs", ostracism, unequal salaries, retarded promotions, poor facilities and then they are met with scorn for a depressed publication rate. An additional problem which has been mentioned by several women is the use by men of the women's accomplishments such as writing or ideas without any credit being given the women. Some of the major classifications of discriminatory treatment which statistics reveal are the following.

1. Recruiting and Admissions. Naturally, if the number of women students in graduate programs is kept extremely low, they will not

be available for faculty positions. We see the extremes of this in the professions. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

2. Training lots of women but hiring next to none or none. This is especially apparent in the Language Departments, Education, History, Psychology and probably many others. The "no inbred hiring" rule and the anti-nepotism rules are often used as rationale.

3. No promotions. Women are clustered in the lowest academic ranks, are rarely promoted to tenured positions despite high qualifications and long years of service. Thus women are excluded from policy-making positions.

The table on page 16 gives a partial picture of the position of women.

It must be stated that the departments investigated cooperated by making the records requested available. Whether they have accepted the interpretation of the data in the manner accepted by various enforcement agencies is another matter. A good faith effort toward redressing the underutilization of women on the faculty in general and in the top levels in particular has not yet been forthcoming. In the majority of cases the departments have continued an all-male hiring practice.

In September 1969, the University Times published a list of new faculty and the table following is based on this source. This source is obviously unsatisfactory, but the University of Pittsburgh Administration has refused to supply the precise data.

The table shows that overall there were 32 women and 158 men on the list of new faculty (17 percent women): The median entry level for men is Assistant Professor; for women, it is one grade lower, i.e. Instructor. In fact, 70 percent of the women employed are below any Professorship level.

DATA ON SELECTED DEPARTMENTS

	Full Prof ♀	Full Prof ♂	Asso. Prof ♀	Asso. Prof ♂	Asst. Prof ♀	Asst. Prof ♂	Instructor ♀	Instructor ♂	Asst. Instr. ♀	Asst. Instr. ♂	Lecturer ♀	Lecturer ♂	Graduate Student ♀	Graduate Student ♂
Dentistry	1	18	1	29	2	60	0	53					5	414
Pharmacy	0	5	0	5	0	4	0	1						
Business	0	14	1	4	0	10	0	3			2	8	4	137
Public and Int'l Affairs	0	18	1	19	1	2	0	3					50	288
French & Italian	0	3	0	6	0	7								
Chemistry	0	16	0	8	0	6	1	5					14	110
Psychology	0	12	1	7	3	14							38	75
Geography	0	3	1	4	1	1	0	3					2	45
History	0	2	0	8	0	7	1	8					34	85

On the Professorship level, of the 113 persons recruited, 9 are female, of whom 8 are Assistant Professors.

The most extreme results are from the School of Medicine and the School of Nursing. Of 58 persons recruited to teach medicine, 5 were women; of 7 persons recruited to teach nursing, 0 were men. The stereotypes of the male doctor and female nurse are untouched.

Chancellor Posvar said: "Pitt's record of hiring women is better than most other colleges." Claiming that he is powerless to do anything about the small percentage of women, the Chancellor said: "race, creed, sex or color cannot be a criterion for filling any such position, nor can we legally or morally justify a quota system for recruiting staff persons, students or faculty. . .". The Chancellor knows that this remark is irrelevant; of course discrimination is unacceptable, and we are not advocating it in any form. But affirmative action programs are acceptable and are even called for by the law. Such a program outlines <u>what</u> the employer thinks can be achieved in a specified time and <u>how</u> it can be achieved.

NEW FACULTY APPOINTMENTS - 1969

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12		13		14		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Full Professors	8	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0
Associate Professors	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	9	1
Assistant Professors	19	0	8	0	6	1	2	0	3	1	5	0	0	1	19	1	4	1	5	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	74	8
Instructors	7	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	22	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	1	35	14
Assistant Instr.	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6
Lecturers	1	0	1	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	11	3
TOTAL	39	5	14	0	15	5	7	0	3	1	8	0	1	1	53	5	6	2	6	0	4	4	0	7	3	0	1	2	158	32

1. Faculty of Arts and Sciences
2. Engineering
3. Education
4. Graduate School of Public & International Affairs
5. Graduate School of Scoial Work
6. Graduate School of Business
7. School of Law
8. School of Medicine
9. Graduates School of Public Health
10. School of Pharmacy
11. School of Dental Medicine
12. School of Nursing
13. Graduate School of Libray & Information Sciences
14. School of the Health Related Professions

22

Women faculty rarely achieve a position in the University which allows them to participate in policy decisions. Whether the Standing Committees of the University Senate actually wield any power is a debatable question, but membership does confer status and prestige. The following table shows the ratio of men to women on these committees. Members are elected by the Senate Council. Although the Chancellor urged the President of the University Senate to include qualified women on these committees (see Appendix F), it can hardly be said that there was any improvement over the past year.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

	Women		Men	
Committees	1969-70	1970-71	1969-70	1970-71
Admissions Committee	1	1	8	8
Athletics Committee	0	0	10	9
Budget Policies Committee	0	0	9	9
Computer Usage Committee	1	1	8	8
Educational Policies Committee	0	1	9	8
Health & Welfare Committee	1	1	9	8
Library Committee	0	1	9	8
Organization and Procedures Committee	0	1	9	8
Plant Utilization & Planning Committee	0		10	
Student Affairs Committee	3	3	6	6
Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee	2		7	
University Press Committee	0		10	

The History Department

While negotiating with the Administration to obtain data for a statistical study of personnel practices in the University, the UCWR decided to approach individual Departments and Schools to discuss the position of women. on February 24, 1970 the Committee, represented by

Dr. Ina Braden, Nancy VanVuuren, and Catherine Marshall met with Dr. Samuel Hays, Chairman of the Department of History. The Committee's research had revealed the following:

History Department Personnel - Winter Term 1970

	Male	Female	Total
Graduate Students, MA	38	22	60
Graduate Students, Ph.D.	47	12	59
TA	7	8	15
TF	20	3	23
Mellon	3	0	3
NDEA	4	0	4
Full Professor	2*	0	2
Assoc. Professor	8*	0	8
Asst. Professor	7	0	7
Instructor	8	1	9
Lecturer	2	0	2
Admin. Asst.	0	1	1
No. 12	0	1	1
Clerk Typist	0	2	2

* indicates joint appointment with another department

At this meeting we pointed out that the only woman on the faculty was at the lowest rank; that women graduate students were clustered at the MA level; and that of persons receiving financial assistance (TA & TF) women outnumbered men only where the grant was lower. We asked Dr. Hays what he planned to do to eliminate these discriminatory practices. He assured us that the Department did not discriminate, that they were interested in quality, not sex, and hired the best person for the job. He added, however, that women seemed to prefer to teach at women's colleges. He also noted that it was not common practice in this country to advertise faculty vacancies and that hiring was done through informal contacts. He indicated no sympathy with our proposal that

public announcement of openings would serve to alleviate the sex imbalance. He pointed out the difficulty of hiring a woman without finding an appropriate position for her husband, but did not appear to consider the reverse situation a problem.

When we turned to the issue of intangible discrimination against women in the department, such as giving less encouragement to women students, or taking their careers less seriously, he denied that it existed. He suggested that if we heard of specific instances of this type of discrimination we should report it to him. He noted that there was a course on Women's History being taught in the Department by a woman graduate student.

Other topics which we wished to discuss concerned treatment of graduate students. For this he referred us to Dr. Peter Karsten. Dr. Hays did agree to our immediate proposals that he publicly indicate his support for Chancellor Posvar's statement, and that we hold a Colloquim on Women's Rights in the Department.

On March 3, 1970 we met with Dr. Peter Karsten to discuss issues involving graduate students. Our research had shown that from 1960-69 the Department had granted the following degrees:

	MA	Ph.D.
Men	104	20
Women	25	4

We wanted to know how the Department recruits its students and what its placement procedures were. Dr. Karsten told us that when the Department is notified of a vacancy, usually through a personal letter to the Chairman or a member of the faculty, he decides which students might be suitable for the job, discusses the matter informally with

Their advisors, and then decides which student to recommend. He added that it was his experience that women's work was inferior to men's. We pointed out how open this system was to discrimination against individuals and proposed that all openings be posted so that each student could decide for himself or herself whether the job was suitable. Dr. Karsten said that the Department had rejected this idea on the grounds that students would then be competing against each other. We asked for information on where graduates of the Department had been place, and at what rank. Dr. Karsten said this information was not available as the Department did not keep such records.

Dr. Karsten is also in charge of departmental activities, so we asked him why such activities were confined to faculty-student football - and activity in which women were reluctant to participate, and a weekly colloquism scheduled for 5 p.m., an hour when most women with family responsibilities are unavailable. He defended both, saying that other activities had been tried and were not popular (picnics, movies) and that scheduling was difficult in that there was always someone for whom a certain hour was inconvenient.

With Dr. Karsten's assistance, a Colloquium on Women's Rights was arranged. This was attended by approximately 10 male faculty members and 8 graduate students, some from other departments. Dr. Ina Braden presented an over-all picture of discrimination against women in various universities, showing that Pitt was among the worst in male-female faculty ratios. Dr. Jo Ann Gardner, President of the Association of Women Psychologists, presented the issues as seen by feminists. During the discussion which followed, several faculty members agreed to support our demands for a University Chilc Care Center, and Dr. Drescher, a

member of the all-male Provost Search Committee agreed to assist our efforts to have women appointed to this committee.

Our evaluation of these meetings was that despite evidence of the failure to encourage and hire women in the historical profession, the Department maintained that it did not discriminate. Although ready to make token gestures (posting of the Chancellor's statement, scheduling a colloquium) the Department felt no need to make any fundamental changes in its structure or procedures. In fact, the Department hired 2 men and no women for 1970-71.

The Psychology Department

One of the many departments where women appear to be underutilized in the facility is the Psychology Department, a department where relatively large numbers of women are being trained. It has been accurately reported that there are 55 times more whooping cranes in the world than tenured women faculty in this department. This situation is particularly ironic in a field such as spychology where in the American culture women excell. Also the flexible hours of academic life attract women more than the industrial setting does, so even more women are available than the proportion graduating. The only cheerful aspect of this situation is that the graduates of the Psychology Department have been streaming into feminist movement and have in fact helped to write this report. The skills of data analysis and scientific objectivity taught the psychology women have become available to the cause of social progress. Psychologists should be particularly concerned about their social responsibility since errors perpetrated by their number have perpetrated cultured stereotypes rather than analyzing them scientifically. The evidence for this charge is just beginning to come to light with the studies of Matina Horne and the Brovermans.

UCWR psychologists talked with several administrators and held a colloquium to discuss discrimination in this field and department. Several women students reported that in the classroom situation where women presently constitute a large body and sometimes a majority, discrimination had ceased to be a problem.

One problem still remaining is the hiring of women faculity. One out of five positions awarded in 1970-71 was awarded to a woman. At this rate of hiring the underutilization of women would never be ameliorated. UCWR recommends hiring 50 percent women at least until the proportion of women faculty equals the proportion women graduate students.

In addition UCWR feels the psychology department has a particular obligation to rid itself of a sexist curriculum and research deficiencies. Causes and research to examine assumptions and practices of spychology as it relates to women should be instituted. All courses should be closely examined for overt and covert sexism and any necessary changes instituted promptly. The Psychology Department has cooperated with UCWR in providing data requested. We hope that the same spirit will prevail in making an immediate and vigorous reformation of the other practices mentioned.

The Rule on Nepotism

One of the policies produced by men and used almost exclusively against women is the anti-nepotism rule. Under this rule, employment of immediate relatives of University employees is permitted only under certain conditions, i.e., when the prospective employee is "unusually competant" in a "specialized or technical field" (not secretarial or clerical) where he/she cannot "influence the working conditions or welfare of the other relative". The administration apparently believes that only relatives

can have unfair influence in the system, while we have observed that friendship rather than qualifications seems to play a very large part in both hiring and promotions throughout the University. We know of no instances where the anti-nepotism rule has been used against men. Nor have we any way of assessing the number of careers which have been ruined by this arbitrary rule. If the system were set up so that objective criteria determined who got hired and promoted then neither the nepotism rules nor the friendship system could be used against women. Appendix E illustrates the working of this rule.

Conclusions

One of the major conclusions we have drawn from our preliminary investigation is that many of the University of Pittsburgh's policies are unfair to both men and women, but especially to women and minorities. Far from a participatory democracy we view the decision-making structure as controlled virtually entirely by a small group of men who then select the additions to or replacements of their group often without ever advertising open positions and, judging from the results, with no effective effort to recruit from groups now underrepresented. It is no wonder that with such a homogeneous and non-representative group deciding on University policy a situation has developed wherein the practice of the University can continue for years in blatant and impudent disregard of the spirit and letter of the law, a law which no doubt conflicts with this groups' own set of male-oriented values. As you might expect when a group or a leader is in a position indefensible from a humanistic or legal standpoint, the attempts at defense include contradictions, half truths, untruths, and eagerly latching onto advice, not because it is right but because it agrees with one's own viewpoint. One thing that is most

regretable is that the energy wasted on conforntations and nefarious attempts to circumvent what the law demands could have been so much better used by both the women and the administration in sincerely working to solve the problem. We grant that the 2 - 4 million dollars estimated as the University's savings from underpaying women will require some readjustments, and that effective apparatus to eliminate sex discrimination will also require substantial sums of money. But a University which can casually spend $700,000 on fake grass for the stadium obviously has some financial leeway and it becomes a matter of priorities.

5. THE ADMINISTRATION

The administration of the University is carried on partly by faculty members who also serve in administrative positions, and partly by full-time administrators. We have already stated that due to discriminatory treatment of women faculty members, few of them reach the top and are therefore excluded from policy-making positions. Thus women are grossly under-represented on committees of the Faculty Senate. If we look at another administrative body, the University Cabinet, we find a similar situation: the Chancellor, Provost, Secretary of the Board, Vice Chancellor for the Health Professions, Vice Chancellor for Students, Vice Chancellor for Finance, Vice Chancellor for the Program of Development and Public Affairs - all are men; only the Director of Planning is a woman. The same ratio seems to hold true on lower administrative levels.

In the belief that University policy toward women will not change until more women, and feminists, appear within the administrative hierarchy, a belief which has been substantiated by the failure of the administration to respond to the suggestion and demands of women's groups for affirmative action in this field, the UCWR has initiated several campaigns to influence the University in the hiring of women.

The Provost Search Committee

When the present Provost announced in the Spring of 1970 his intention to retire as of January 1971, a search committee was formed of faculty and students to propose candidates to the Chancellor. Some members of this committee were appointed, some were elected, some did not know how or why they had been chosen. There were no women on the committee.

The UCWR believes that the position of Provost, which carries responsibility for all academic programs at the University, including budget decisions is of enormous significance to women. We therefore circulated a petition demanding 1) that women be considered equally with men for this position 2) that to ensure the equal consideration of women, women must be present on the search committee.

On 8 May 1970 the search committee held an open meeting to allow the University Community to express its views on the necessary qualifications of the new Provost. Representatives of several campus women's groups attended this meeting and, after lengthy and sometimes angry discussion, convinced at least some members of the committee that it should suspend

its operations until the women of the University were adequately represented.

Further discussions were held and the Chancellor eventually appointed one woman faculty member to the committee. The appointee was not one of those recommended by the UCWR. She had not been active in any of the women's rights groups. Furthermore, she was not one of a group of four women feminists who had been recommended to the Chancellor as candidates by the search committee in conference with university feminists.

Teach-In at the Chancellor's Office

On May 18 the UCWR held a Teach-In at the Chancellor's Office attended by about 25 women from various women's rights groups. After a 2 1/4 hour wait, the group was able to meet with the Chancellor and discuss with him the content of its 8-page statement. This statement began:

> After painstaking efforts over the last six months to secure fair treatment for women using the methods of discussion and negotiation, the UCWR has concluded that it is futile to pursue any further the repeated referral from one administration to another.

The statement further demanded the following affirmative actions:

1. Hiring of women for top administrative positions, including a Vice Chancellor for Women, an Administrator for Staff women, a Director of Day Care Center, a Director of Recruitment and Student Advising of Women.
2. Creation of an Interdisciplinary School for Women's Studies composed of persons sympathetic to and preferably active in behalf of feminists who would hold joint appointments with the appropriate academic department.
3. Immediate policy changes to assure equal treatment of women throughout the University.
4. Publication of a report by the Administration every six months concerning progress towards full equality for women.

The statement concluded with a specific list of ways to implement these demands, largely policy changes which would involve no expenditure of University funds.

The result of the Teach-In was an inconclusive memo from the Chancellor agreeing in abstract terms that a comprehensive and lengthy review

of the status of women at the University should be undertaken, but refusing to act on the specific issues of hiring women administrators or establishing a School of Women's Studies and totally ignoring our other practical proposals. (See Appendix D) Thus once again our proposals for immediate action to alleviate the position of women were shunted aside and buried under a mountain of administrative investigation.

The Faculty Senate

One of the results of the UCWR's discussions with the administration on the release of personnel data for making a statittical study, was a memo to the President of the University Senate 10 March 1970 requesting the opinion of the Senate as to 1) the appropriateness of the UCWR as representative of women faculty, students, and staff; 2) financial support for UCWR; 3) the propriety of releasing personnel information and in what form. These questions were subsequently referred to the Senate Committee on Health and Welfare.

At a meeting between the Chairman and one member of this committee and a representative of UCWR, these issues were explored and a decision made to hold a joint meeting on 13 May for further discussion. Prior to 13 May the President of the Senate announced certain decisions pertaining to the UCWR and the matters under discussion. The UCWR therefore refused to continue these now pointless negotiations and on 13 May appeared at the meeting to demand a recommendation from the committee for a top administrative post to be devoted exclusively to the concerns of women.

The 19 June meeting of the Faculty Senate did consider a report from the Health and Welfare Committee which contained 3 resolutions:

One initiating and supporting "affirmative action programs" which shall involve women in appropriate numbers in all decision-making processes at the University.

One urging the president of the Senate to nominate for advisory committee (See below) membership "persons committed to the spirit of the foregoing resolution."

One urging academic officers studying employment and career opportunities for women to "emphasize equal salaries and promotion opportunities."

These innocous resolutions were passed, while the UCWR proposals for an Office to Equalize the Status of Women, a large-scale Child Development Center, a School for Feminist Studies, and full compliance with federal

anti-sex discrimination laws by 1 September 1971 were defeated. The UCWR proposal which was agreed to enjoined the University from lobbying against the addition of sex as a criterion in federal anti-discrimination statutes.

Advisory Committee on Women's Opportunities

The Chancellor's final response to date to the actions and demands of the UCWR has been to initiate a comprehensive study of university programs as they relate to women. (See Appendix F.) This study is to include 1) educational programs for women; 2) career opportunities and services for women faculty; 3) admissions, counseling, financial aid, housing, placement and special services that affect women students; 4) career opportunities and services for non-faculty women employees. It is to be carried out by the existing administrative officers of the University who are exclusively male. In connection with the study, the Chancellor has named an Advisory Committee on Women's Opportunities consisting of representatives from faculty, students, staff, and administration. The following letter to the University Times illustrates the reaction of the UCWR:

Chancellor Initiates In-Depth 'Women' Study

In a recent memo, Chancellor Wesley Posvar called for a "comprehensive study of University programs, policies and procedures relating to the education, employment and career development of women in the University."

The memo is addressed to the provost, vice chancellors, assistant chancellor, deans, directors, regional campus presidents and department chairmen, many of whom will be involved in conducting the study.

The study is to be organized into the following four divisions (1) educational programs for women; (2) career opportunities and services for women faculty; (3) admissions, counseling, financial aid, housing, placement and special services that affect women students, and (4) career opportunities and services for non-faculty women employees. Each topic is to be investigated by one or more administrative officers of the University, with the help of others addressed by the Chancellor.

Further, the Chancellor's memo outlines an Advisory Committee on Women's Opportunities, which is to provide advice and assistance in the conduct of the study. The committee is to be composed of four faculty members appointed by the president of the University Senate; four students, to include the elected presidents of the Women's Housing Board, the Association of Women Students, the Panhellenic Association, and one graduate student; four non-faculty employees appointed by the director of personnel, and four administrators appointed by the Chancellor. At least three-fourths of the committee members will be women.

In his memo, Chancellor Posvar requested that the committee be representative "of a broad range of attitudes and opinions," and that it should "be made to include representation of the principal academic and administrative divisions of the University."

The committee will serve for a period of eight months, and will recommend whether a continuing women's advisory group is desirable. A final report including evaluations and recommendations from the study project is to be submitted by January 15, 1971.

UNIVERSITY TIMES

A PUBLICATION FOR THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY AND FRIENDS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Vol. 2, No. 20 Thursday, June 25, 1970

Published bi-weekly by the

UNIVERSITY NEWS & PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT

200 S. Craig Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213

35

LETTER

Femi

To the editor:

As one of the people appoi
newly formed advisory com
study sex discrimination in the
I have been inquiring of oth
who have been working dili
this problem whether they
been appointed. They have n
ently, the committee is to hav
ken representation (me) of th
from the University Committe
men's Rights who have been m
ed in pressuring the University
with current legislation. If thi
cere effort to remove sex d
tion then the other following
must be answered:

1. Why was the advisory
formed without consultation
versity feminists. After all, la
participation of women in
which affect the university an
themselves is one of the ma
plaints of women.

2. Why was the committee
constituted of kinds of orga
which have never evinced in
equal rights for women.

3. Why was there no prov
relieving the members of the c
from all other duties, providing
ly for the committee, especia
neys, statisticians and research
providing consultants fees and
erally making the kind of prac
visions which a vigorous hard
committee would need. We sug
the University should appoin
feminist vice chancellor and h
some of the highly qualified
which it has fired to serve as pa
staff of an Office to Equalize t
of Women under the propo
chancellor.

LETTER

Feminist Objects

To the editor:

As one of the people appointed to the newly formed advisory committee to study sex discrimination in the University I have been inquiring of other women who have been working diligently on this problem whether they also have been appointed. They have not. Apparently, the committee is to have only token representation (me) of the women from the University Committee for Women's Rights who have been most involved in pressuring the University to comply with current legislation. If this is a sincere effort to remove sex discrimination then the other following questions must be answered:

1. Why was the advisory committee formed without consultation with University feminists. After all, lack of the participation of women in decisions which affect the university and women themselves is one of the major complaints of women.

2. Why was the committee partially constituted of kinds of organizations which have never evinced interest in equal rights for women.

3. Why was there no provision for relieving the members of the committee from all other duties, providing staff solely for the committee, especially attorneys, statisticians and research assistants, providing consultants fees and just generally making the kind of practical provisions which a vigorous hard working committee would need. We suggest that the University should appoint a new feminist vice chancellor and hire back some of the highly qualified feminists which it has fired to serve as part of the staff of an Office to Equalize the Status of Women under the proposed vice chancellor.

4. Why was the committee given no power or status? In this country there are scores of examples of laws and ordinances which were never obeyed until they were given enforcing power. For example pollution control rulings never worked without negative consequences and most people don't stop at red lights just because they care about the other people but because of learning which was influenced by possible punishment.

5. Why are the persons who have been appointed to perform the studies concerning women and to consult with the advisory committee the same men who have been primarily responsible for the ongoing discrimination against women?

6. Why are the units of the University which have large proportions of women not represented on the advisory committees; namely, the regional campuses and school of general studies?

7. Why was the person who is one of the top ranking feminist leaders (leader of two national feminist organizations) in the country, Dr. Jo Ann Gardner, fired instead of being placed on the advisory committee?

Perhaps as a first order of business the advisory committee should turn its attention to the advisory committee itself and to the proposed studies, both of which have been devised by the University administration rather than by the women working for equal rights, which illustrates very well the problem in the administration of paternalism and lack of regard for the human resources which women constitute.

Ina Braden for
The University Committee
for Women's Rights

6. THE STAFF

The staff of the University consists almost entirely of women employed as secretarial and clerical workers. The salary is so low that some qualify for welfare. If they are fired, they receive no unemployment compensation. The salaries paid are so entirely arbitrary that at the whim of the administrator the raise for employee A is sometimes given to employee B in order to recruit B. Senior employees sometimes make less money than less qualified new employees. When "raises" are given they usually do not even keep up with the rise in cost of living. Saddest of all is the fact that there is no reasonable, much less just, system for retirement. Until January 1970, ther was none at all and now the University and employee each pay $10 per month, if the employee so elects. We have seen very old women come in to work part time because they can't make ends meet on Social Security alone.

Why then do women work at the University? First of all, the University is the second largest employer in the Pittsburgh area so that University jobs constitute a large proportion of all the secretarial and clerical jobs available. Secondly, the tuition benefits attract some people; staff personnel get free tuition but pay some fees for their personal education and they get "free tuition" for their children. If their children can't afford day school or can't qualify for day school, however, the children get no evening school tuition benefits. The third major reason for working at the University is that many consider the work more interesting than industrial work. We think it is time the staff not be punished for liking their work.

This situation is deplorable in basic human terms, but the system operates in such a way as to discriminate particularly against women.

Hiring

The Personnel Department is in charge of recruiting staff for all positions. Despite UCWR protests, they insist on giving every woman applicant a typing test, thus indicating their predilection for placing all women in secretarial or secretarial administrative positions.

In advertising staff openings the University has traditionally used the "male" and "female" want-ads according to its preference based on sex. A complaint lodged with the Human Relations Commission failed to persuade the University to discontinue this practice, shown to be one which discourages qualified women from seeking more rewarding jobs. In June, 1970, the University notified the UCWR that as of 31 May it had changed its and would use the compined "male-female" want-ad column when possible.

Coincidentally, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, on 2 June, formally released its guidelines which prohibit the use of "male" and "female" want-ads unless sex is a bona fide occupational qualification. As a major federal contractor, the University is subject to this guideline.

In this matter, all appeals to the University which were based on justice, reason, economics, human concern, morality, and social leadership were ignored; the fear of a pending investigation by the OFCC was effective.

Furthermore, the University has found ways to evade the consequences of their published policy. The Personnel Department does not include all job openings in their listings. When they do not want to advertise in the combined "male-female interest" column, and do not have bona fide grounds for specifying "male' or "female" they use an employment agency to fill the position, as the following example shows:

Admin.

CAMPUS

ASSISTANT

ADMINISTRATOR

to $750

Now you can enter the finist administrative position in the local area today with this respected institute of higher learning where you will assist college administrative leaders while earning top salary, all benefits, paid fast raises and FREE TUITION. For a confidential interview, call 261-4566. United Consultants of Pittsburgh. 421 Seventh Ave. Employment Agency.

This advertisement appeared first in the male interest want-ad column of the PITTSBURGH PRESS, June 21, 1970. A man answered the ad and was told by the Employment Agency representative during an interview that the position required shorthand and typing skills, and that the University of Pittsburgh, who had listed the position, had specified a man.

A woman, also a member of the UCWR, then answered the ad and was told during a telephone conversation that the position did not require secretarial skills. When the woman then went for the personal interview at the Employment Agency, she was told she was overqualified, and that the position really did require clerical-type work. When questioned about this the agent did state the position was with the University of Pittsburgh, but refused to place the woman's name in application for the position.

It might be noted here that according to the Job Classification Manual, and the salary scale, no position requiring secretarial skills is listed with a salary up to $750 per month, with benefits, or with free tuition.

When the ad appeared again on the 7th of July, this same woman telephoned the agency. The male representative who had interviewed her was out so the woman who answered the phone talked with the applicant. The representative of the agency stated the position was as assistant to a Dean at the University of Pittsburgh and that the applicant must have secretarial skills in order to be able to take letters. The applicant responded that the Dean undoubtedly had a secretarial staff. At this, the agency representative said she would ask the Dean whether or not he would remove the secretarial skills qualifications. The applicant pointed out that every time she applied for administrative work she was told she must have experience, and since this position was advertised as providing such experience, it would seem a perfect opportunity. As of 1 November the applicant has received no further response.

Channeling and Promotions

Women are routinely channeled into poorly paid job categories. Jobs which require similar amounts of education and training but which have a higher title and salary are populated mostly by men although the duties actually performed may be identical to those of the lower paid women. Men in such jobs are considered for promotion; they are on their way up the administrative ladder. The women remain in dead-end secretarial positions.

Grievance Procedure

A just grievance procedure strikes at the very heart of a nondemocratic system. For this reason UCWR has persistently pushed for a fair grievance procedure which will permit unfair practices and policies to be challenged, allow the complainant to be represented by counsel at every stage, to be judged by a jury of peers, and to receive prompt justice.

The procedure adopted by the administration on 15 January 1970 was, in the words of a University official, "right out of a book on personnel management." It specifically limited employee grievances to "questions of the application of established policies," and put the employee entirely at the Mercy of the Director of Personnel who was empowered to select the grievance committee and its chairman.

This committee could veto the appearance of witnesses whose testimony they considered irrelevant. The employee had the 'right to counsel' only if his complaint went as far as a hearing before a committee.

In March, 1970, the UCWR presented to the University its version, approved by legal counsel, of a just grievance procedure. On 17 June, 1970, the Personnel Division published a revised procedure which made only minor improvements: the complainant at last has the right to be accompanied by counsel at all stages; he or she may select the three members of the grievance committee, although the Personnel Director submits to her or him the five names from which to choose; the committee may no longer veto witnesses called by the grievant.

Despite this very modest improvement in procedure, many employees are still unaware of its existence, and decisions are still being made arbitrarily by the administration, as always.

7. DISCRIMINATION AND THE LAW

The strength of UCWR's efforts to end sex discrimination at the University of Pittsburgh lies in the law. Not only is the University unjust in its treatment of women, it is breaking the law.

The University is subject to city, state, and federal laws and the Executive Orders which require equal pay for equal work, and equal opportunity. These laws include the Equal Pay Act (1963), Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Executive Order 11246 as amended by 11375, State of Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, State of Pennsylvania Freedom of Information Act, City of Pittsburgh Human Relations Ordinance, and libel laws. Other legal action can be taken under the first and fourteenth amendments to the U.S. Constitution. For enforcement of the civil rights laws and and the Executive Orders the following administrative agencies have been established, and their services must be exhausted before the complainant can go to court:

Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, Pittsburgh
State of Pennsylvania, Human Relations Commission
Equal Economic Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC)

UCWR has initiated the following legal actions:

1. In March 1970 UCWR formally filed a complaint with the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations. The City Ordinance prohibits discrimination by any employer with respect to hiring, tenure, compensation, promotion, discharge, or any other terms, conditions or privileges. It also prohibits publishing or circulating any notice or advertisement relating to employment or membership which indicates discrimination.

Because of the Commission's limited staff, it was unable to handle the complaint immediately. Over the summer a woman student from Pitt was hired (without our consultation) who helped work on the complaint. Apparently a few meetings were held with University officials, but nothing was accomplished except the collection of raw data, not including race, which UCWR has specified must be collected. The Human Relations Commissioners agreed on October 28, 1970, to obtain that information. The data has not yet been analyzed.

2. Convinced that the Mayor's Commission was not moving on the complaint, UCWR filed a complaint with the Labor Department under Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 which prohibit sex discrimination by federal contractors.

Under the Labor Department's guidelines, federal contractors with 50 or more employees and a contract of $50,000 or more, must develop a written plan of affirmative action to prevent discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, or national origin. They must also set goals and timetables for correcting existing discrimination. The Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) administers the Executive Orders for the Department of Labor.

In July, 1970 Federal Compliance Officers from H.E.W. visited Pitt for a week, during which time they met with UCWR, women in the University, and University officials, and collected data. On October 22 and 23 the Compliance Officers returned to Pitt to examine whether or not the University was acting in good faith in moving toward the elimination of six discrimination. All the University had done was to establish the Chancellor's Advisory Council (formerly "Committee") on Women's Opportunities and to require a study of Women's Opportunities, to be conducted by the male top administrators in the University. The Advisory Council members have no time off and no additional help in their work which would free them for Council work. After months of negotiations, the University finally allowed the Council to hire one part-time secretary and an administrative assistant at a salary of $519 per month, and only for four months.

The University has until November 7 to show cause for the Federal Government to think they intend to end sex discrimination. The Chancellor had first one white male administrator and then another working "night and day" putting together an Affirmative Action program, still without consulting UCWR or the Chancellor's own Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities. He also has required that all Department and Administrative Heads (99 percent men) give him a statement by November 2 on the situation in their departments and

what they will do about it - still without any counsultation with women.

3. A complaint was made in October, 1970 under the Equal Pay Act. This was done in the form of a telephone call to the Equal Pay office alleging discriminatory salaries.

4. A formal suit against the University is now being prepared by UCWR, since administrative channels have been exhausted. This will include action under the first and fourteenth amendments, Freedom of Information Act, Title VII, and libel laws. Such court action will take a long time, but it will help to establish legal precedents, and will provide a means to educate the courts and the community to the problems and issues involved in sex discrimination. The suit will include four categories of persons: students, staff, faculty, and taxpayers.

Appendix G contains the text of the complaint under the Executive Orders and replies from the Department of Labor and HEW.

Other agencies which should have been available to help with the obvious civil liberties case of the Pitt women such as the American Civil Liberties Union, were of very little help as organizations, although a woman working for them, Ivy Minelli, was of great assistance performing legal research and after a search lasting almost a year found us an attorney willing to take the case. Another organization which should be concerned about women is the American Association of University Professors but it has more or less ignored the problem of sex discrimination for years. Most universities do not have unions or even employee organizations for the majority of their employees to afford any protection to their economic life. Thus, the only reliable and functioning protection currently available to university women is the Federal Government in the form of the Department of Labor and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which administers the Executive Orders for the Department of Labor.

8. CONCLUSIONS

A Warning to Other University Women's Rights Groups

Some of the attempts used by the University Administration to subvert the women's demands may possibly be tried by other institutions. The attempts included:

1. Subfuscation of information and stalling tactics
2. Using women's rights issues to line the pockets of more men
3. Setting up a "company" women's rights group
4. Pitting women and Black men in the administration against the activist women

If nothing else, these attempts can divert attention and energy from the efforts of women to attain equality. In the matters of statistics and stalling it matters little whether the universities are just inefficient or maliciously motivated. It can win them time, and all the time won allows the installation of more and more men in the upper level positions and the further deterioration of the careers of the women. We have observed repeatedly that a woman on the brink of success,for example, in the form of obtaining a major research or training grant is particularly likely to be harrassed or pushed out by the "top-level" men in the University. So even a year lost in negotiation or litigation is crucial to such individual women. We found negotiation useless so we recommend to the readers Bernice Sandler's advice to file a complaint at an early stage as soon as you determine that the action or speed of change is insufficient.

Especially now that major funding may be becoming available for providing training and opportunities for women it is crucial that women themselves be the ones to plan programs and administer these funds. Already at Pitt we have seen the clever men hurriedly trying to acquire such funds. To allow men to do this helps perpetuate such men in their positions given the influence and status that government funds provide. Also it is urgently important that women be allowed to solve their own problems to help break the old patterns of male paternalism which affects in opposite ways both women and men.

Perhaps one of the best jokes on the Administration was that their own hand-picked group of women, the Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities which was top-heavy with women in administration and admittedly designed to keep the women busy talking to each other did in fact gradually become another women's rights organization.

Fortunately, some of the hand-picked women were feminists although not known to be somby the Administration. All of the Council members appeared to become more concerned and angry as they learned more about the depth and breadth of sex discrimination at Pitt and as they received group support from the Council. The response of the Administration to the Advisory Council as it had been to UCWR was to become increasingly anatagonistic and to refuse the Council's requests and demands. On the other hand, the unfortunate part about the Council is that it took months of study for the women to reach a stage where they could actually get moving on problems. In addition, it appears to require a certain personality type or set of experiences to enable women to continue pushing when the Administration becomes threatening. So we sometimes noted in the Council the same trend we saw in ACLU and AAUP. When the topic is highly charged or the atmosphere negative the organization will concern itself with relative trivia rather than the substantive or "hot" issues. Because the Council sometimes buffered the Administration from the demands of UCWR and because of the time consumed by UCWR in working with the Council we conclude that it would probably have been the Council established or for UCWR not to have invested much energy in it.

One of the Administrative ploys which is difficult ot handle is the use which the Administration makes of Administrative women and of Administrative Black men. As we mentioned earlier the Administration loaded the Council with Administrative women, some of whom would, under the stress of a major meeting, either back the male Administration or attack the Council and disassociate herslef from Council decisions. What complicates the situation is that many of these same women have in the past when it was even more dangerous helped individual women, and view themselves as advocates for women.

Possibly this problem will cease to exist when the support group for women who help other women becomes strong so that the women administrators will feel that their own success will not be endangered by publicity working for women. Some few of these women, however, have totally accepted the male value system and thus may never be able to identify with their sisters. The Black male administrators are a somewhat different kind of problem. The white male administrators at Pitt apparently feel confident enough of their loyalty so that at some meetings between UCWR the compliance officer and the Pitt Administration, The Administration was represented by 50 to 100 percent Black males, despite their very low proportion in the administration. Some of the Balck male administrators will say quite frankly that they view the women's demands as competitive with that of Blacks for the limited amount of funds which they say the University will be willing to spend on allevinting discrimination. The fact that Black males have done virtually nothing at Pitt for the job advancement of Black women indicates that sexism is not exclusively a white male prerogative nor is caring about the civil rights as well as yourself limited to any one sex or race. Ironically, the women's rights activists have been active in the Civil Rights Movement a result of which many of these Black males administrators received their positions. However, so far, the Black males have not chosen to fight with the women to expand the programs for both minorities and women.

Many or most of the problems described will settle themselves if the Federal Government continues along the course of enforcing civil rights legislation for the women and for minorities. If with the help of the Federal Law enforcement agencies UCWR will succeed in achieving equality for women at Pitt then the lessons to be learned by our experience is that perhaps it is not too late to work through the system - it just takes a healuva lot of work and some patience.

In addition, the year long battle by UCWR for equality for all women has taken a rather heavy toll, particularly of its officers: four officers and one member either transferred, fired, contract not renewed, or gotten rid of by the University . Not making a bid when the office was offered a better pay job. In addition, considerable harrasement in the form of implied threats of firing, asking a UCWR officer to resign from her office and even physical harrassment of a woman mistaken for a member who then became one! This would seem to indicate the need for stronger enforcement of the past Executive Orders which prohibits harrassment of persons in any way associated with efforts to have this civil rights legislation enforced.

Even so, the members of UCWR look back on their first year with considerable satisfaction. Not only was the struggle itself exhilerating in the sense of actually doing something to change a system which was harming many people but it was gratifying to actually see many of our goals on the way to accomplishment and the economics lives of many women improved in this relatively brief period of tim. Moreover, we are hopeful that many basic changes will follow to lessen the authoritorian structure of the University. But in the final analysis it depends on whether the individual members of the University Community will stand up and accept some of the responsibility for getting their rights and for caring about the other members of the community. We in UCWR feel we've done and are doing as much as we can.

APPENDICES

MEMO ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AT STATE UNIVERSITIES

DATE: June 10, 1970

There are legal grounds which require that the University Committee on Women's Rights' request for statistical information from the University of Pittsburgh of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be granted.

24 P.S. §2510-202, also listed in Other Laws Affecting Education put out by the Department of Public Instruction, under University of Pittsburgh - Commonwealth Act §2886.1, states

> Legislative Findings: Declaration of Policy
> It is hereby determined and declared as a matter of legislative finding:
> (6) That the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania recognizes University of Pittsburgh as an integral part of a system of higher education in Pennsylvani and that it is desirable and in the public interest to perpetuate and extend the relationship between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and University of Pittsburgh for the purpose of improving and strengthening higher education by designating University of Pittsburgh as a state-related university.

Unier 24 P.S. § 2510-202 (b) the University of Pittsburgh, as an "instrumentalit of the Commonwealth" serving as a "State-related institution in the Commonwealth system of higher education," is an "Agency" under 65 P.S. § 66.1 of June 21, 195 P.L. 390, Act. No. 212, also listed as article XXXVI, §3601 (1) in Other Laws Affecting Education. Subsection (1) provides:

> (1) " Agency." Any department, board or commission of the executive branch of the Commonwealth, any political subdivision of the Commonwealth. . . any State or municipal authority or similar organization created by or pursuant to a statute which delcares in substance that such organization performs or has for its purpose the performance of an essential governmental function.

Subsection (2) is applicable to the University of Pittsburgh of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, because the University is an agency of the Commonwealth. "Any account, . . .dealing with the. . . use . . . of services . . and any minute, order or decision by an agency fixing the personal . . . rights, privileges, immunities, duties or obligations of any person or group of persons" is included in the meaning of "Public Record," which must be made available to the Univer- Committee on Women's Rights in accordance with their request.

> (b) Every public record of an agency shall, at reasonable times, be open for examination and inspection by any citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
> (c) Any citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have the right to take extracts or make copies of public records and to make photographs or photostats of the same while such records are in the possession custody, and control of the lawful custodian thereof or his authorized deputy. . .

(65 P.S. § 66.1 (2) (b) & (c); Other Laws Affecting Education, §3601 (2) (b) & (c).)

The Equal Pay Law of the Commonwealth, to which the University of Pittsburgh of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is subject under the definition of "employer" provided in the Act, requires that the records to which the University Committee of Women's Rights seeks access must be kept by the University. The Equal Pay Law requires that

> Records and Reporting
> Every employer subject to this act shall make, keep and maintain such records of the wages and wage rates, job classifications and other terms and conditions of employment of the persons employed by him, and shall preserve such records for such period and shall make such reports therefrom as the secretary shall prescribe. 1959, Dec. 17, P.L. 1913, §6.
> (43 P.S. §336.6, also appearing in Other Laws Affecting Education, Article XXXVII (e) §3766.)

Under these three statutes, the infromation sought by the University Committee on Women's Rights must be kept and maintained in the Records of the University, and any request for access to it by any citizen of the Commonwealth must be granted by the University.

June 2, 1970

50

Mr. William H. Rae
Chairman, Board of Trustees, University of Pittsburgh
One Oliver Plaza
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Dear Mr. Rae:

Dr. Ina Braden of the University Committee for Women's Rights requested that we provide you with information relevant to the question of whether statistical information is adequate evidence of discrimination.

U.S. v. H.K. Porter, 296 F. Supp. 40 (N.D. Ala. 1968), cited by University Counsel, does not support his assertion that statistical differences alone cannot prove discrimination. In that case the court stated that

> Where evidence showed that white employees had worked substantially more hours through temporary assignments from extra board than had Negro employees, employer has the burden of presenting evidence to show that such employment did not result from discriminatory practices. at 106-107

The court did indicate that other evidence in addition to statistics should not be disregarded and might outweigh the statistical evidence.

Nor did the Chicago State College case, also cited by University Counsel, involve the inadequacy of statistical proof. There the court held that the failure to promote the plaintiff Negro to full professor resulted solely from an evaluation of his ability. In fact the court itself relied on statistical evidence of the promotion of other Negroes in rejecting the plaintiff's claim. (Lewis v. Chicago State College, 299 F. Supp. 1357 (N.D. Ill. 1969).

The law is in fact contrary to that asserted by the University Counsel. In Alabama v. United States, 304 F. 2d 583, affirmed, 371 U.S. 37 (5th Cir. 1962) at 586 the court stated: "In the problem of racial discrimination, statistics often tell much, and Courts listen." See also Monroe v. Board of Commissioners, 391 U.S. 450, (1968) which also relied heavily on statistical recitations.

In the recent case of U.S. v. Sheet-Metal Workers International Association, Local No. 36, AFL-CIO, 416 F. 2d 123 (8th Cir. 1969) the defendants argued that the Court could not rule in favor of the government unless the government proved that a number of particular Negro individuals had sought and had been denied union membership or related benefits. The Court, however, permitted the government to make a more general showing, that is the Court said that it was enough for the government to establish a pattern or practice of discrimination. In finding such a pattern the Court relied heavily on statistical evidence showing

few Negro members in the Union.

This principal which has been long established in cases of racial discrimination recently has been applied in a sexual discrimination case. In Shultz v. Brookhaven General Hospital, 305 F. Supp. 424, (N.D. Tex. 1969) the Court relied upon statistical records of salaries and wages to show a pattern of sexual discrimination.

I thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

Gilbert T. Venable

Gilbert T. Venable, Esq.
Executive Director

CC: Chancellor Posvar
Dr. Braden
James Wolf, Esq.

GTV/iem

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15213

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY

MEMO TO The Chancellor's Staff, Deans, Directors, Campus Presidents, Department Chairmen

FROM Wesley W. Posvar

DATE January 22, 1970

Subject Fair Employment Practices

As you are aware, the University of Pittsburgh has a policy of nondiscrimination in employment and in educational opportunities, consistent with federal, state and local laws. That policy includes nondiscrimination because of sex as well as because of race, religion, or nationality.

This policy means that the sex of a student shall not be a factor in determining who will be admitted, given financial support, and recommended for placement after the student has completed his academic work. Women employees must be recruited, hired, paid and promoted on the same basis with men.

It is the responsibility of each of you, in carrying out the regular duties of your office, to insure that discrimination does not exist in the areas for which you are responsible and that any discrimination now existing is removed as soon as possible.

The Office of the Vice Chancellor of Finance will obtain data for the University Committee for Women's Rights to study existing conditions affecting women faculty, students and staff in the University to determine the degree to which discrimination exists and to recommend actions necessary to insure equal treatment for women. Your cooperation is requested if you are called upon to help provide the data.

Women who believe they are being discriminated against because of their sex may bring such information to the attention of the University Committee for Women's Rights, 427 Salk Hall, telephone 683-1620, extension 2413. Such information shall be treated in confidence and no person furnishing such information shall be subject to recrimination in any form.

Women who are not members of the faculty may also avail themselves of the recently published grievance procedure if they believe that they are being discriminated against as employees of the University.

Appendix C-2

February 16, 1970

Chancellor Wesley W. Posvar
106 Cathedral of Learning

Dear Chancellor Posvar:

I hope you had a pleasant trip to africa, but I am sorry to inform you that in your absence we have not been granted access to information. It was our understanding that the staff you assigned to help us was to collect the data we requested without delay and with the only exception being the attachment of the names of employees to the data concerning them. In fact, we have met with a series of manuevers such as stalling, complaining, misinterpreting our requests, unsolicited advice about how to design the study, classic "put downs" and irritated refusals to produce what our experts deem requisite information. Most recently a trip to Mrs. Jones office (after two weeks to allow data collection from the various departments) resulted in a dismissal by the secretary that there was no data for us.

We have delayed publicizing these difficulties out of consideration for you and because we can understand the agitation in the Office of Finance. Perhaps the Office of Finance is not the proper agency in the University to work with us. Their lack of time and commitment may very well have occasioned many of the difficulties.

No matter what the reason, we are finding that our attempts to collect the data has been extremely time consuming for the officers of our organization. If you can think of a way to do it we would appreciate some way of legitimizing the time taken from our regular work efforts, which we have been required to devote to this study.

We are fortunate to have both a professional statistician experienced in employee analysis and several experimental psychologists available to consult and help with the study. On this basis I'm sure you understand our curiosity about what the real objection is to our data collection. We plan to have the study be a high level analysis of all of the bariables available which might operate in sex discrimination. We have offered to begin with a minimal number

of variables while awaiting the computer programming of the other more detailed data. The economic excuses we have heard are not legitimate because we generously estimate the cost for collection of the data by the Personnel Department of be $600 assuming that they pay their help $5 per hour.

We hypothesize that the objections must be either bureaucratic ones or fear that the data will be used for legal action. We already have sufficient data for legal action so that is not a valid fear. The only positive thing I can say about the resistance we have met is that it has certainly strengthened our determination.

I think possibly only you will be able to understand and to cut through the various impediments to our study. At the meeting with us and in your statement you seemed to express active and sincere interest in our efforts to discover the sources of discrimination and to eliminate them. On the basis of our experience to date we can certainly sympathize with the energy and tolerance it requires from you to try to shift the University from any status quo position. We would greatly appreciate any advice and assistance you can offer us in what we think is our mutual advantage in making Pitt a model University by promoting fair and just treatment for University women employees and students. We now believe it will require full support directly from your office to allow us to continue our study on the present cooperative basis.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ina Braden
Chairman

IBps

Appendix C-3

February 20, 1970

Mr. Edison Montgomery
Vice Chancellor of Finance
2428 Cathedral of Learning

Dear Vice Chancellor Montgomery:

Thank you for your cooperation at our meeting on February 19. May I recap some of the conclusions? You agreed to provide from Personnel's records the following items: an identifying number, sex, race, job classification, highest degree, salary basis (monthly, yearly, etc.), salary, department and possibly the year the degree was granted.

Our statistician feels, and we concur, that we must have a minimum of the first 500 by the end of February and one/third of the data by the middle of March. I was pleased to hear you say that it would not require "months and months" to collect the data and we would certainly be delighted if the speed of collection surpasses our expectations.

Sincerely,

Ina Braden, Ph.D.
Chairman

IB:ps

cc: Chancellor Posvar
Mr. Leland Deck

Appendix C-4

February 20, 1970

Chancellor Wesley W. Posvar

106 Cathedral of Learning

Dear Chancellor Posvar:

We want to report briefly on the meeting between Vice Chancellor Montgomery, Hilda Jones, several of our members, our statistician and in an unofficial capacity, one of the staff members from the Human Relations Commission.

The meeting seemed to go well. Our statisticina described in great detail the statistical design and reiterated the low cost required to collect the data. Mr. Montgomery agreed to provide the data we needed from the Personnel Department. He and Hilda Jones indicated that we can personally collect the data concerning students from the individual departments, some of whom evidently are reluctant to provide such data. Now, unless some other delay occurs, we will be able to get on with our work.

We thank you for anything you may have done to smooth the way.

Sincerely,

Ina Breden, Ph.D.
Chairman

IB:ps

Appendix C-5

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

TO: Dr. Ina Braden, Chairman, University Committee for Women's Rights

FROM: Edison Montgomery

DATE: 26 February 1970

SUBJECT: Data on Faculty and Staff

As I told you at our meeting on 19 February, we shall provide the data on faculty and staff to your Committee as quickly as we can. I told you at that time, however, that I can make no promises to meet deadlines. The quantity of data that you have requested and the fact that they come from at least two sources make the job much more time-consuming than your request of a month ago would have been.

Let met reaffirm that we will get the data to you as quickly as we can.

cc: Dr. Wesley W. Posvar
Mr. Leland Deck

Appendix C-6

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

TO: Dr. Ina Braden, Chairman, University Committee on Women's Rights

FROM: Edison Montgomery

DATE: 2 March 1970

SUBJECT: Data on Women Employees

Because we have uncovered some rather strong feeling about releasing identifiable data on employees in the University, I have instructed Mr. Deck to give you coded data, but not to identify the departments in which persons are employed. The objection of Dr. McWilliams, as you might suppose, precipitated our looking into the problem. But it does appear that in many areas there are so few women employed that the data could not be kept anonymous if the department were identified.

6384 Jackson Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15206
May 18, 1969

Richard H. McCoy
Director of Graduate Programs
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dear Dean McCoy,

I received your letter of April 1 informing me that I had been awarded an Andrew Mellon Fellowship for the 1969-1970 academic year and that my stipend was to be $2,500 plus remission of tuition. This is the base stipend without a dependency allowance for my two children.

Thinking there had been an oversight, I spoke to you about this matter a week or so after having received your letter. You made the statement then that you were following the NSF regulations in your administration of the Mellon Fellowships, and implied that the reason you had not given me a dependency allowance for my children was that you knew that my husband, an assistant professor of Chemistry at this University, has an income higher than the amount of my fellowship. It is my opinion that your decision and your reasons for making it are irregular in that you are applying criteria to my case that you are not applying to other Fellows about whom you do not have the same information because you do not solicit it. Furthermore, as will be seen by the information furnished below, your decision is irregular in comparison with the precedents set by the regulations and administration of other fellowships, including the NSF, in so far as the definition of what constitutes a dependent is concerned.

I have been for the last three years an NDEA Title IV Fellow and have received for the full time of my tenure dependency allowances for my children under the following regulation:

> Allowable dependents include husbands, wives and children (including Step-children). They are claimed under the provisions for basic (or immediate) dependents. The fellow may claim an allowance for each such individual providing the wife, husband or child does not have an anticipated income greater than $2,000 for the year claimed. (Fellows' Handbook, Fall 1966.)

Since my children are now nine years and twelve years old respectively and have no income, they come under this provision. I also call your attention to the fact that there is no distinction made as to the sex of the Fellow in these regulations: they apply equally to women Fellows. The concept of a dependent is defined specifically by the amount of the dependent's income without regard to outside circumstances of other relatives.

The regulations for the NSF Graduate Traineeship Program list the following criteria for the determination of dependency allowance entitlement:

1. You may request dependency allowances only for your spouse, and/or children born to or legally adopted by you and your spouse.
2. You may not claim as a dependent a person who receives any stipend or subsistence allowance from any program of Federal educational assistance (except loans) or who is claimed as a dependent by another person under any program of Federal educational assistance.
3. If your tenure is 12 months, an allowance may not be claimed for a spouse whose income--before any deductions--is expected to exceed $2,000 for the 12-month period of your award. If your tenure is 9 months, an allowance may not be claimed for a spouse whose income--before any deductions--is expected to exceed $1,500 for the 9-month period of your award. ("Trainee Personal Data Form," 1968.)

By the use of the word "spouse" it is perfectly obvious that these regulations apply equally to men and women and to the dependent children of the Fellow without regard to the sex of the Fellow and without regard to outside circumstances of other relatives.

I have located without difficulty, which would seem to indicate the existence of other similar cases, two current Mellon pre-doctoral Fellows whose marital and economic statuses are the same as mine and who are receiving dependency allowances. The first is a male whose wife at the time of the award was employed and whose income was higher than the amount of his stipend. He was given a dependency allowance for her. It is difficult to understand how you can consider a wife to be a legitimate dependent of her husband even though her income is higher, when you do not consider my children to be my dependents even though they have no income and even though I am legally responsible for their support. Under the standards applied to the above-mentioned case, I should be claiming my husband also as a dependent. How can it be assumed that a married woman is her husband's dependent no matter what her income, but a married man is not his wife's dependent no matter what his income? If this in fact is the assumption, as it is the practice, it is clearly discriminatory to women and it is the kind of thinking that discourages women from seeking professional careers.

The second Fellow is a woman whose husband is currently employed at the University and whose income is greater than the amount of her stipend. She receives a dependency allowance for her child, but not for her husband.

The official announcement of the 1969-1970 Andrew Mellon Fellowships for predoctoral study which is issued by your office, and which according to you secretary is the only printed information available on the Mellons, contains the following statement: "The stipend will be $2,500 for the academic year, plus remission of tuition and an allowance of $400 each for one, two, or three dependents." The application form for the Mellon Fellowships solicits information only regarding marital status and number and ages of children. Nowhere on the application or in the regulations for the Mellon, the NDEA or the NSF fellowships is there a mention of or a question about the amount of a spouse's income. This is irrelevant and personal information which has only to do indirectly with the spouse's elegibility for being claimed

as a dependent. It has nothing to do with the status of children or with their dependency which is defined by the amount of their income. As I have pointed out above, there is no distinction made in the NDEA or the NSF regulations as to the sex of the Fellow, nor is this distinction made in writing on the Mellon Fellowship announcement. However, by your oral rhetorical question to me as to who has the higher income in my family, you are making a requirement in my case which you do not apply across the board to all Fellows, you are asking a question of me which is not asked of other applicants and recipients of this or the NDEA and NSF fellowships, and you are saying that because I am a woman that my children are not my dependents. I wish to point out to you again that I am legally responsible for the financial support of my two children; they are my dependents.

The issue here is not just the issue of the $800 a year to which I am entitled, it is also the issue of equal treatment of women and of equal treatment of me as a graduate student in good standing who happens also to be a faculty wife.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Yours truly,

Dorin Schumacher

Dorin Schumacher
NDEA Fellow
Department of French and Italian Languages
and Literatures

cc: Wesley W. Posvar, Chancellor
Charles H. Peake, Provost
Steele Gow, Acting Dean of Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Caryl M. Kline, Director, Continuing Education for Women

Appendix E

STATEMENT OF CATHERINE EDNER-SYPHER

In March, 1966, while still a student at Clarion State College, I received an N.D.E.A. Fellowship for graduate work in Rhetoric and Public Address from the University of Pittsburgh. The fellowship was for three years and I was to work toward completion of a Ph.D. degree. I entered the University of Pittsburgh in September, 1966.

I met and married Bill Sypher, a teaching assistant completing his Ph.D. in Communications Research, a separate area of the Speech Department from Rhetoric and Public Address.

In August of 1967, I relinquished my fellowship to teach at Ligonier High School for one term. Bill remained at the University. I returned to Pitt in January, 1968, as an adjunct instructor to teach speech couses. In April, 1968, I was given a teaching assistantship. To summarize, both Bill and I were receiving assistance from the Speech Department, each in his own particular area.

In September, 1968, Bill was given full-time faculty status in the Speech Department. In December, 1968, I was granted an M.A. degree. At that time I asked to be admitted into the Ph.D. program. I was told by the Department Chairman, Jack Matthews that, although I was qualified to enter the Ph.D. program I could not do so. He said that since Bill was now a full-time faculty member, the nepotism ruling, which says something to the effect that no two members of the same family can be on the payroll of the University or receive assistance from the same department, was in effect. He also said that I could not take courses in the Speech Department or be granted a degree from that department.

I reminded him that both Bill and I had been accepted prior to our marriage and that I should not be penalized for having married. He indicated that it was irrelevant and that the nepotism ruling was clear on the matter. I then asked whether I would be acceptable to the committee if Bill and I divorced. He smiled. At the time, divorcing Bill to get into the Ph.D. program did not seem to be the best course of action. I left the Speech Department in April, 1969.

Ironically enough, in October, 1969, I was given employment as a research assistant at the Learning Research and Development Center of the University of Pittsburgh. This is clearly in violation of the nepotism ruling. But I remain. There are numerous examples of the University's willingness to hire people who are qualified for particular positions regardless of whom the individuals had the good (or bad) fortune to marry. I should be admitted to the Ph.D. program in the Speech Department.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15213

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY

MEMO TO Provost, Vice Chancellors, Assistant Chancellor, Deans, Directors, Regional Campus Presidents and Department Chairmen

FROM Wesley W. Posvar

DATE May 29, 1970

Subject: Educational and Career Opportunities for Women

The University of Pittsburgh is opposed to all forms of discrimination on the basis of sex, race, religion or national origin. The University favors equal opportunities for women in respect both to education and employment.

Overall, the University has had considerable success in improving conditions of women students, faculty and staff members, and its record with respect to admission of women students, recruitment and promotion of women faculty and administrators and provision of employment opportunities to women has been good as compared with other similar institutions.

We know, however, that much improvement is still needed. To this end, a number of actions have been taken recently to protect more adequately the rights of all faculty and staff, and to improve the status of women in the University. Last January, I sent to each of you a memorandum stressing the need to insure equal treatment of women faculty and staff members in employment, promotions and salaries. A new procedure for handling non-faculty employee grievances was recently established, and, on the basis of your comments, is now being revised. A new policy on non-faculty personnel management was distributed last week. In addition, I have just written to the President of the University Senate, urging him to include qualified women on committees of the Senate, and to the Women's Association suggesting that they may wish to include in their program for next year the issue of the status of women in our society.

While these are constructive steps, I do not believe that they are adequate to address the full range of issues and concerns that have been raised by women members of the University community. I am initiating, therefore, a comprehensive study of University programs, policies and procedures relating to the education, employment and career development of women in the University. This project, which will be conducted over the next several months, will involve a review and evaluation of current programs, policies and practices and the formulation of specific recommendations to improve them.

This study will be organized in four divisions.

1. Educational programs for women. (Provost Charles H. Peake and Vice Chancellor Francis S. Cheever)

2. Career opportunities and services for women faculty. (Provost Charles H. Peake and Vice Chancellor Francis S. Cheever)

3. Admissions, counseling, financial aid, housing, placement, and special services that affect women students. (Assistant Chancellor Bernard J. Kobosky)

4. Career opportunities and services for non-faculty women employees. (Vice Chancellor Edison Montgomery)

This project will be carried out by the above-named officers of the University, with the support and cooperation of persons to whom this memorandum is addressed.

Reports in each of these four major areas will be submitted to me in accordance with the following schedule:

First Report - November 1, 1970
Final Report - January 15, 1971

To provide advice and assistance in the conduct of this study, an Advisory Committee on Women's Opportunities will be established. This committee will be independent of the governing structure of the University and will have the responsibility of inquiring into the current status of women, reviewing policies and proposals, and advising and counseling the officers of the University during the conduct of this study. The committee will have the additional responsibility of reviewing and commenting on formal proposals and reports in the major project categories described above.

To gain representation of a broad range of attitudes and opinions, the Committee on Women's Opportunities will be comprised as follows:

-four faculty members appointed by the President of the University Senate, at least three of whom should be women.

-four students, to include the elected presidents of the Women's Housing Board, the Association of Women Students, the Panhellenic Association, and one graduate student.

-four non-faculty employees appointed by the Director of Personnel, at least three of whom shall be women.

-four administrators appointed by the Chancellor, at least three of whom shall be women.

In making these appointments, efforts should be made to include representation of the principal academic and administrative divisions of the University and a range of viewpoints. The committee shall establish its own procedures and select its own officers, including at least a Chairman and a Vice Chairman. The point of contact of the committee with the University administration for staff support and liaison shall be the Director of Institutional Research and Planning Studies.

This committee shall serve for a period of eight months, unless extended with the committee's consent for an additional period. Upon completion of the current project, it will recommend whether a continuing women's advisory group is desirable and the manner in which it should be constituted to be both representative and effective.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE for WOMEN'S RIGHTS

University of Pittsburgh
427 Salk Hall
683 1620 ext. 2413

March 26, 1970

The Honorable George P. Schultz
Secretary, Dept. of Labor
14th St. Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20210

Dear Mr. Schultz:

Please consider this a formal complaint under Federal Executive Order 11246 as amended by Federal Executive Order 11375.

The University Committee for Women's Rights of the University of Pittsburgh has worked diligently for approximately three months to obtain data concerning salaries and all other relevant information necessary to scientifically analyze the problem of discrimination at this University. The University Committee for Women's Rights has available for such a study a Ph.D. statistician with five years experience in employee analysis and several Ph.D. level experimental psychologists. The response of the University has been only promises to supply the data followed by a succession of changing excuses as to why they would not do so. The following table grossly sums up the situation at the University of Pittsburgh.

Percentage of Women in Administrative and Faculty Positions[1]
University of Pittsburgh

Chancellor	0%	Professor	3%
Vice Chancellor	0%	Associate Professor	9%
Academic Dean[2]	13%	Assistant Professor	17%
Department Head	7%	Instructor	31%
		Lecturer	25%
		Undesignated Rank	25%

It should be noted that these figures show a lower percentage of women in the top faculty levels than the national average of all universities and is even lower than the average for the twenty leading universities (1960 figures).

[1] The percentage of women in faculty positions is much lower in some individual departments.

[2] Both of the 2 female deans are in traditionally feminine occupations: Nursing and Health Related Professions.

Nor does the discrimination directed toward women end at the top level University Positions. Different job classifications with differential salaries are often given men as opposed to women according to reports from several staff members.

The awarding of fellowships to graduate students is another area requiring scrutiny. For example, in the University of Pittsburgh History Department, the teaching fellowships which pay $300 more than teaching assistantships are heavily weighted with males (20 men to 3 women) while the lower paying teaching assistantships are distributed to 7 males and 8 females (1969-70). Because graduate study is the academic form of apprenticeship it is crucial that the policy of nondiscrimination required by the executive orders be instituted immediately.

Another critical area of discrimination is that of admissions. In American medical Schools there is a well-known quota system restricting the number of women admitted to 7% or less. The recent figures from the University of Pittsburgh Medical School are congruent with a quota system. The percentage of women in this professional training program is 7%. Even worse, the percentage of women medical students in 1969-70 sank to 3%. The fact that women accepted into Medical School over the years have had somewhat higher objective qualifications than the male students strongly implies a discriminatory bias in the selection procedure. For example, in 1969-70 the mean quality point average of women admitted was 3.61 while that of men was 3.32.

We have reason to believe from these and many other preliminary figures and complaints from individuals that discrimination on the basis of sex exists at the University of Pittsburgh in the form of:

1.) admission of students
2.) student support
3.) hiring of staff and faculty
4.) channeling of women into lower paying job classifications
5.) promotions
6.) tenure
7.) placement of graduating students
8.) many others

When practices like these are permitted to exist freely, they are reflected in the psychological and social aspects of Academic Life as well, so that women are discouraged by advisors and faculty from aspiring to higher education and in some cases women report that they have been demoted for complaining about discrimination.

I expect that you will be convinced of the need for immediate and effective action by the Federal Government. The attempts by the University Committee for Women's Rights to work with the Administration to discover and eliminate areas of sex discrimination have failed and thus wasted time. While executive orders 11246 and 11375 are being ignored some women at the University who are receiving salaries actually low enough to qualify for welfare are working at two jobs to support their families.

Of course there is no real way to compensate the women whose careers have been stunted or destroyed over the last 50 or 100 years. But at least women have a right to expect that existing executive orders be enforced so that these practices do not continue for even one more year. The University of Pittsburgh receives many grants from Federal Agencies and thus the Federal Government is actually subsidizing discrimination against women.

We demand not only the elimination of present discriminatory practices but affirmative action such as child care centers, availability of part time study programs and a large number of scholarships for women in areas where they are currently excluded or restricted. In addition to the many promotions which will be needed to place women in the positions which they would no doubt have attained had the system been truly free, it will be necessary to eliminate policies of secrecy of salary scales and personnel records which work against any group receiving discriminatory treatment. Furthermore, full scale and sincere recruiting efforts must be instituted to attract women into professional life.

It is ironic that this plea for "law and order" from the oppessed majority has to be made to the current administration in view of campaign promises. At the University of Pittsburgh women observe that the Blacks have achieved at least a beginning toward most of the goals of full and equal participation in University Life which are now being denied women. The method which was effective in producing these accomplishments for Blacks was violence at both the local and national level. If this is not to become the only method of achieving equality in this country then peaceful methods must be afforded immediate attention and action.

It is urgent that you contact me during the compliance review for more information. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Ina Braden

Ina Braden, Ph.D.
Chairman, University Committee for
Women's Rights

cc Sec. Finch
Senator Hugh Scott
Senator Richard Schweiker
Governor Raymond Schaffer

Appendix G-2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20210

APR 15 1970

Ina Braden, Ph.D.
Chairman, University Committee
for Women's Rights
University of Pittsburgh
427 Salk Hall
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Dear Dr. Braden:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 26, 1970, to Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz.

We have asked the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to look into your allegations of discrimination on the basis of sex in employment by the University of Pittsburgh. HEW is the Federal Executive Department that serves as the compliance agency, under Executive Order 11246, for colleges and universities. We expect HEW to conduct a compliance review at the University of Pittsburgh within the immediate future. During the course of this review, officials of the agency will be in touch with you for whatever additional information they may require.

Sincerely yours,

John L. Wilks

John L. Wilks
Director

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20201

May 13, 1970

Ina Braden, Ph.D., Chairman
University Committee for Women's Rights
University of Pittsburgh
427 Salk Hall
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15214

Dear Dr. Braden:

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance, Department of Labor, has designated the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the responsibility for reviewing the employment practices of institutions of higher education and determining their compliance with the provisions of the Executive Order 11246 as amended by Executive Order 11375. In keeping with this designation, your letter of March 26, 1970, to Secretary Schultz has been forwarded to this office for action.

For some time, higher educational institutions have been included in the schedule of reviews that assess compliance with the equal employment provisions of the Executive Orders. However, we have recently taken steps to insure that the process of review more adequately covers policies, practices and data applicable to the employment of women.

In view of the information you have given on the University of Pittsburgh, a compliance review at that facility will be scheduled if possible within the next 60 days.

I appreciate the information you provided in your letter and look forward to meeting you either previous to or during the review. You may contact me at the address given below or by telephoning Area Code 202/ 962-0571.

Sincerely yours,

Rose E. Brock

Rose E. Brock
Contract Compliance Specialist
Office for Civil Rights

Contract Compliance Division
DHEW/Office for Civil Rights
7th & D Sts. SW. - ROB-3
Washington, D. C. 20201